

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 and 29-32 are pending at the time of the Final Office Action. In the Final Office Action mailed on April 8, 2008, the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a); (2) objected to the amendments filed on January 25, 2008 under 35 U.S.C. 132(a); (3) rejected Claims 1-24 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; (4) rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; (5) rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren (U.S. 6,097,835) in view of Fraisse (U.S. 7,171,912); (6) rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Fraisse, and in further view of Lee (U.S. 5,995,681); (7) rejected Claims 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Fraisse and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa (U.S. 5,864,632); (8) rejected Claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7 Science Data User's Handbook solar illumination algorithm ("Landsat-7"); (9) rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Lindgren in view of Landsat-7, and in further view of Lee (U.S. 5,995,681); (10) rejected Claims 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7 and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa; (11) rejected Claims 17, 20-21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7, and in further view of Lee; (12) rejected Claims 18-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7 and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa; (13) rejected Claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lindgren; (14) rejected Claims 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lindgren, and in further view of Ogawa; and (15) rejected Claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse the

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

rejections, request entry of the above-proposed amendment, as well as reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The elements related to "the multispectral band images do not include a panchromatic band image" have been canceled from the relevant claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

II. Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objected to specification under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The elements related to "the multispectral band images do not include a panchromatic band image" have been canceled from the relevant claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-24 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 25-29 are hereby canceled. The elements related to "the multispectral band images do not include a panchromatic band image" have been canceled from the remaining pending claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

applicant regard as the invention. Claim 29 is hereby canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Lindgren (U.S. 6,097,835)

Lindgren teaches a projective panchromatic sharpening method and apparatus that combine registered high spatial resolution panchromatic imagery and lower spatial resolution multispectral imagery to synthesize higher spatial resolution multispectral imagery. (Column 2, Lines 61-64). The projective panchromatic sharpening apparatus comprises a first component that determines the linear radiometric relationship between the panchromatic and multispectral bands, and a second component that processes pixels to produce the sharpened product. (Column 2, Lines 1-8).

Fraisie (U.S. 7,171,912)

Fraisie teaches a map for fertilizer application that is created using a map of site-specific amounts of the soil nutrient needed to produce the maximum possible yield at the particular site. (Column 3, Lines 1-4). Specifically, nutrients currently existing in a field are subtracted from the site-specific amounts of nutrients needed, thus producing a map of site-specific nutrient amounts to be added. (Column 3, Lines 5-15).

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Fraisie. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

1. A method for correlating data from multispectral band images produced by different sensors, the method comprising:
 - spatially matching a plurality of multispectral band images produced by different sensors, the multispectral band images having different resolution levels;
 - performing at least one of a solar illumination correction and an atmospheric correction on the spatially matched images; and
 - spectrally correcting one or more of the spatially matched images the spectrally correcting includes:
 - extracting first radiometrically stable data values associated with first control points in a first image;
 - extracting second radiometrically stable data values associated with second control points in a second image, the second image having a resolution that is lower than a resolution of the first image;
 - forming an aggregated first data value for each of the second data values by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value;
 - comparing the aggregated first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
 - generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
 - applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. First, Lindgren does not recite, as claimed in Claim 1:

- extracting first radiometrically stable data values associated with first control points in a first image;
- extracting second radiometrically stable data values associated with second control points in a second image, *the second image having a resolution that is lower than a resolution of the first image;*
- forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value.* (Emphasis added).

In contrast, Lindgren does not disclose the aggregation of a plurality of data values from a higher resolution images that correspond to a single data value in a lower resolution image into a single aggregated data value. Instead, Lindgren discloses the opposite, that is, the “upsampling” of a “lower spatial resolution” image, such as a multispectral imagery (MSI)

image, to a "higher spatial resolution image," such as a panchromatic image, via interpolation. (Column 1, Lines 20-25; Column 4, Lines 3-9; Column 4, Lines 66-67; Column 5, Lines 1-2). Specifically, the relevant section of Lindgren discloses:

Secondly, for pan sharpening pixel processing, *the MSI images are resampled to the pan image resolution* and projected onto the hyperplane associated with overlapping pan pixel intensity, p-b, and "normal" vector, w. FIG. 1 illustrates the linear spectral model initialization and pan sharpening pixel processing steps. (Column 4, Lines 3-9; Figures 1-2). (Emphasis added).

Furthermore, additional sections of Lindgren also disclose:

One prior art method for pan sharpening is to simply resample MSI intensities to pan resolution using standard methods such as *nearest neighbor, bilinear, or bicubic interpolation*. (Column 4, Lines 66-67; Column 5, Lines 1-2).

Since the process of "interpolation" is different from "aggregation", the fact that the disclosure of Lindgren teaches the "upsampling" of a lower resolution image into a higher resolution image via various forms of pixel interpolation, does not recite "forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*," as claimed in Claim 1.

Second, the deficiencies of the Lindgren are not remedied by Fraisse. Fraisse discloses making atmospheric corrections to satellite images. (Column 7, Lines 4-22). However, Fraisse does not recite, "forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*," as claimed in Claim 1.

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren and Fraisse do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 1:

comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to
the extracted second data values of the second image;
generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and

applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren and Fraisse, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or suggest the method claimed in Claim 1. Furthermore, since Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, it is at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 1 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claims 1-2.

Lee (U.S. 5,995,681)

Lee teaches a digital image processing system that reduces errors in the parameters of a sensor geometry model. (Column 1, Lines 11-15). Lee teaches the use of a co-registration mechanism to co-register the reduced accuracy working digital image with a reference image. (Column 2, Lines 41-44). The imagery co-registration operator adjusts the respective geometry models associated with the input images to bring the respective images into effective co-registration on image registration surface. (Column 2, Lines 2-59).

Claim 3

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Fraisse, and in further view of Lee. Claim 3 depends from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references to Lindgren and Fraisse, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest, “forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value,*" as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Second, Applicants respectfully submit that the deficiencies of Lindgren are also not remedied by Lee. Lee disclose setting a plurality of control points in the images based on landmark information and aligning images based on the set control points. (Figure 1). However, Lee does not recite, "forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value,*" as claimed in Claim 1.

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren, Fraisse, and Lee do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 1:

comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren, Fraisse, and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or suggest the method claimed in Claim 1. Furthermore, since Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, it is at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 1 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claim 3.

Ogawa (U.S. 5,864,632)

Ogawa teaches a map editing device that is capable of supplementing insufficient information and re-measuring an object that has changed. (Column 1, Lines 64-66). The map editing device generates and displays a perspective projection map when a user manually changes the projection center and the projection angle. (Column 2, Lines 33-39). The map

editing is also capable of supplementing insufficient information based on the projection center and the projection angle. (Column 2, Lines 39-50).

Claim 4-8

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Fraisse and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa. Claims 4-8 depend from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and assert that the cited references to Lindgren, Fraisse, and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest, “forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Lindgren are not remedied by Ogawa. Ogawa teaches a means for extracting ground control points from tracing the images of objects such as roads, buildings, fields, and woods. (Column 6, Lines 30-38). However, Ogawa does not recite, “forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren, Fraisse, Lee, and Ogawa do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 1:

comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren, Fraisse, Lee, and Ogawa, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or fairly suggest the method claimed in Claim 1.

Furthermore, since Claims 4-8 depend from Claim 1, they are at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 1 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4-8.

Claims 9-10

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7. Claim 10 depends from Claim 9. Claim 9, as amended, recites:

9. A system for correlating data from two or more satellite images from different sensors, the system comprising:
 - means for spatially matching a plurality of multispectral band satellite images produced by different sensors;
 - means for performing a solar illumination correction on the spatially matched satellite images; and
 - means for spectrally correcting one or more of the spatially matched satellite images the means for spectrally correcting further includes:
 - means for extracting first radiometrically stable data values associated with first control points in a first image;
 - means for extracting second radiometrically stable data values associated with second control points in a second image, the second image having a resolution that is lower than a resolution of the first image;
 - means for forming an aggregated first data value for each of the second data values by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value;
 - means for comparing the aggregated first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
 - means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
 - means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), to the extent that the claims recited similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited reference to Lindgren does not teach or suggest, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Lindgren are not remedied by Landsat-7. Landsat-7 discloses solar illumination corrections. However, Landsat-7 does not recite “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren and Landsat-7 do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 9:

means for comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren and Landsat-7 whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest the system claimed in Claim 9. Furthermore, since Claim 10 depends from Claim 9, it is at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 10 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claims 9-10.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7, and in further view of Lee. Claim 11 depends from Claim 9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references to Lindgren and Landsat-7, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value,*” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Lindgren are not remedied by Lee. Lee discloses a display device 25 that displays satellite images. (Column 1, Lines 52-56). However, Lee does not recite a “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value,*” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 9:

means for comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references (Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee), whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest the system claimed in Claim 9.

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Furthermore, since Claim 11 depends from Claim 9, it is at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 9 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claim 11.

Claims 12-16

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7 and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa. Claims 12-16 depend from Claim 9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Lindgren with respect to this limitation are not remedied by Ogawa. Ogawa teaches a means for extracting ground control points from tracing the images of objects such as roads, buildings, fields, and woods. (Column 6, Lines 30-38). However, Ogawa does not recite, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 9. (Emphasis added).

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, Lee and Ogawa do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 9:

means for comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, Lee, and Ogawa, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or fairly suggest the system claimed in Claim 9. Furthermore, since Claims 12-16 depend from Claim 9, they are at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 9 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claims 12-16.

Claim 17, 20-21, and 23-24

Claims 17, 20-21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7, and in further view of Lee. Claims 20-21 and 23-24 depend from Claim 17. Claim 17, as amended, recites:

17. A system for correlating a plurality of satellite images from different sources, the system comprising:
- a user interface device;
 - a display device;
 - a database for storing landmark information; and
 - a processor coupled to the user interface device, the display device, and the database, the processor including:
 - means for instructing the display device to present one of the satellite images based on the stored landmark information;
 - means for setting control points in the satellite images based on a signal generated by the user interface;
 - means for aligning the images based on the set control points;
 - means for performing a solar illumination correction on the aligned images; and
 - means for spectrally correcting one or more of the aligned images, the means for spectrally correcting further includes:

means for extracting first radiometrically stable data values associated with first control points in a first image;
means for extracting second radiometrically stable data values associated with second control points in a second image, the second image having a resolution that is lower than a resolution of the first image;
means for forming an aggregated first data value for each of the second data values by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value;
means for comparing the aggregated first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Specifically, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 17. (Emphasis added).

Second, since the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 17:

means for comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Furthermore, since Claims 20-21 and 23-24 depend from Claim 17, they are at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 17 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited.

Claims 18-19 and 22

Claims 18-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Landsat-7 and Lee, and in further view of Ogawa. Claims 18-19 and 22 depend from Claim 17. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 17. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Lindgren with respect to this limitation are not remedied by Ogawa. As noted above, Ogawa teaches a means for extracting ground control points from tracing the images of objects such as roads, buildings, fields, and woods. (Column 6, Lines 30-38). However, Ogawa does not recite, “means for forming *an aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*”, as claimed in Claim 17.

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, Lee, and Ogawa do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 17:

means for comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

means for generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
means for applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren, Landsat-7, Lee, and Ogawa, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or fairly suggest the system claimed in Claim 17. Furthermore, since Claims 18-19 and 22 depend from Claim 17, they are at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 17 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claims 18-19 and 22.

Claims 30-32

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindgren in view of Lee. Claims 31-32 depend from Claim 30. Claim 30, as amended, recites:

30. A method for correlating data from multispectral band images produced by different sensors, the method comprising:
spatially matching a plurality of multispectral band images produced by different sensors;
setting a plurality of control points in the images based on landmark information; and
spectrally correcting one or more of the spatially matched images, the spectrally correcting includes:
extracting first radiometrically stable data values associated with first set control points in a first image;
extracting second radiometrically stable data values associated with second set control points in a second image, the second image having a resolution that is lower than a resolution of the first image;
forming an aggregated first data value for each of the second data values by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value;
comparing the aggregated first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. First, Applicants respectfully incorporate the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, Applicants assert that Lindgren does not recite, “forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 30. (Emphasis added).

Second, Applicants respectfully submit that the deficiencies of Lindgren are also not remedied by Lee. Lee disclose setting a plurality of control points in the images based on landmark information and aligning images based on the set control points. (Figure 1). However, Lee does not recite, “forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value*,” as claimed in Claim 30.

Third, since the cited references to Lindgren and Lee do not recite the element mentioned above, the cited references also cannot recite, as claimed in Claim 30:

comparing the *aggregated* first data values of the first image to the extracted second data values of the second image;
generating a correction factor based on the comparison; and
applying the correction factor to all radiometric data of the second image. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Lindgren and Lee, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or fairly suggest the method claimed in Claim 30. Furthermore, since Claim 31-32 depend from Claim 30, they are at least allowable for the same reason that makes Claim 30 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawn of the rejection of Claims 30-32.

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

VI. *New Claims*

Claims 33-37 are newly added. Claims 33-36 depend from and apply additional limitations to Claim 32. Accordingly, Claims 33-36 are allowable for at least the same reasons that make Claim 1 allowable, as well for additional limitations recited.

Claim 37 recites "forming an *aggregated* first data value for each of the second data values *by combining a plurality of the first data values that correspond to each second data value.*" Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 37 is believed to be allowable over the cited references.

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the above-proposed amendments be entered and that pending Claims 1-24, 30, and 32-37 be allowed. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8-15-08

By: 

Elliott Y. Chen
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 58,293
(206) 315-7914

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER